

AMENDMENT OF CLAIMS

1 (CURRENTLY AMENDED) - Fluorescent light fixture comprising;

- a - a plurality of elongated light reflectors and each end of said elongated light reflectors attached to socket mount/wire raceway arms ,
 - b - said socket mount/wire raceway arms attached to ends of ballast channel assembly,
 - d1 c - a single ballast mounted in said ballast channel assembly ,
 - d - fluorescent light tube sockets for a plurality of elongated fluorescent light tubes mounted on said fluorescent light tube socket mount/wire raceway arms , at each end of said elongated light reflectors in the concave side of said elongated light reflectors,
 - e - a plurality of said elongated fluorescent light tubes inserted into said fluorescent light tube sockets in the concave side of said elongated light reflectors and,
 - f - rim edges on said elongated light reflectors overlap on adjacent rim edges , of said elongated light reflectors.
-

2 - (CURRENTLY AMENDED) Fluorescent light fixture of claim 1, further consisting of ;

- A1
Cont.
- a - a plurality of said elongated light reflectors and each of said elongated light reflectors attached to socket mount/wire raceway arms and,
 - b - two of said socket mount/raceway arms attached one on each end perpendicular to ends of said ballast channel assembly,
 - c - a single ballast mounted in said ballast channel assembly,
 - d - light tube sockets for a plurality of said elongated fluorescent light tubes mounted on said socket mount/wire raceway arms at each end of said plurality of said elongated light reflectors in the concave side of said plurality of said elongated light reflectors and,
 - e - said plurality of said elongated fluorescent light tubes inserted into said light tube sockets , in the concave side of said elongated light reflectors and,
 - f - slots in said elongated light reflectors for indirect lighting and
 - g - suspending , by hanger wire/chain, said assembly of said fluorescent light fixture ~~from a ceiling~~ .
- redundant

3 (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A fluorescent elongated fluorescent tube light tube fixture , of claim 1, wherein further improvement consists of ;

- A1
cont
- a - said elongated light reflectors fitting over said elongated fluorescent ~~elongated tube~~ light tubes for maximum light reflection downward,
 - b - said ~~fluorescent~~ elongated fluorescent tube lights having a diameter D, then the radius R of the bend of the cross section of said elongated light reflectors is $D \times 0.875$,
 - c - ~~the an~~ arc at ~~the said~~ bend of said elongated light reflectors is equal to 120°
 - d - the sides of said elongated light reflectors are tangent to ~~the said~~ radius at the ends of said arc
 - e - said elongated light reflectors sides extend outward to a dimension between sides of said elongated light reflectors equal to $3.25 \times$ the diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube ,
 - f - the distance between said elongated fluorescent ~~tube~~ light tube and the said arc of the bend of said elongated light reflector is equal to $0.375 \times$ diameter of said elongated fluorescent tube light tube and,
 - g - distance from bottom of said elongated fluorescent light tube to span line between side edges of said elongated light reflector is equal to $0.5 \times$ diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube.

4 (CURRENTLY AMENDED) A method of focusing downlight of a fluorescent hanging light fixture consisting of ;

- A1
cont
- a - elongated light reflectors over each elongated fluorescent elongated light tube,
 - b - said elongated light reflector extending the length of said elongated fluorescent elongated light tube,
 - c - cross section of said elongated light reflector comprising an arc straddling said elongated fluorescent ~~elongated~~ light tube and at a space of 0.375 times diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube from said elongated fluorescent ~~elongated~~ light tube,
 - d - said arc of said elongated light reflector having a radius of 0.875 times the diameter of said elongated fluorescent ~~elongated~~ light tube and said arc ranging from 120° to 160° and,
 - e - sides of said elongated light reflector , tangent at each end end of said arc range of said elongated light reflector,
 - f - a single ballast mounted in a ballast channel assembly and,
 - g - a plurality of said elongated light reflectors and said elongated fluorescent elongated light tubes mounted in said fluorescent hanging light fixture.
-

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 7

PAPER # 6

5 (CURRENTLY AMENDED) An elongated fluorescent light fixture of claim 1,
wherein further improvement comprises;

- Amend.*
- a - a plurality of at least five and not more than eight said elongated
fluorescent light tubes mounted in a fluorescent light ~~tube assembly~~
fixture and,
 - b - a ballast mounted in said ballast channel of said
elongated fluorescent light fixture.
-

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 8

PAPER # 6

A1
CROSS

6 - (CURRENTLY AMENDED) Elongated ~~fluorescent~~ light ~~tube~~ reflectors ,
of claim 1, selected from the group consisting of polished sheet metal,
metal coated plastic and metal coated glass.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 9

PAPER # 6

7 (NEW) A fluorescent light fixture of claim 1, wherein further improvement comprises;

- Al cont.*
- a - a plurality of at least five and not more than eight said elongated fluorescent light tubes mounted in said fluorescent light fixture ,
 - b - a ballast mounted in said ballast channel assembly of said fluorescent light fixture ,
 - c - said elongated light reflectors selected from the group consisting of polished sheet metal, metal coated plastic and metal coated glass and,
 - d - rim edges of said elongated light reflectors overlap on adjacent rim edges of adjacent said elongated light reflector.
-

8 (NEW) A fluorescent elongated tube light fixture comprising;

- A1*
concl.
- a - a plurality of elongated light reflectors and each end of said elongated light reflectors attached to socket mount/wire raceway arms ,
 - b - two of said socket mount/wire raceway arms attached , one on each end perpendicular to ends of ballast channel assembly,
 - c - a single ballast mounted in said ballast channel assembly,
 - d - light tube sockets, for a plurality of elongated fluorescent light tubes, mounted on said socket mount/wire raceway arms, at each end of said plurality of said elongated light reflectors in the concave side of said plurality of said elongated light reflectors,
 - e - said plurality of said elongated fluorescent light tubes inserted into said light tube sockets, in the concave side of said elongated light reflectors ,
 - f - said elongated light reflectors, fitting over said elongated fluorescent light tubes , said elongated light tubes having a diameter of D, then the radius R, of the bend of the cross section of said elongated reflector is $D \times 0.875$,
 - g - said arc at said bend of said elongated light reflector is equal to 120° and sides of said elongated reflectors are tangent to the radius at ends of said arc ,
 - h - said sides of said elongated light reflectors extend outward to a dimension between said elongated reflector sides equal to $3.25 \times$ diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube,
 - i - the distance between said elongated fluorescent light tube , and said arc of said bend of said elongated light reflector is equal to $0.375 \times$ diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube and,
 - j - distance from bottom of said elongated fluorescent light tube to span line between edges of said elongated light reflector is equal to $0.5 \times$ diameter of said elongated fluorescent light tube.
-

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 11

PAPER # 6

COMMENTS REGARDING CLAIMS 1 -3,5,6

Claim 1, (currently amended) Amendments made to this claim in accordance with suggestions made in Office Action paper # 5, to correct lack of proper antecedent form such as " a reflector" to "elongated light reflector".

Claims 2,3,5 and 6 (currently amended) to correct lack of proper antecedent form in these claims..

No new matter is entered in amendments to the above claims, and they now overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph . Request is made to withdraw the rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 112 , second paragraph in view of the following citations;:

COURT OF CUSTOMS AND PATENT APPEALS

206 USPQ 289

In re Clemens, Hurwitz, and Walker

No. 79-595

Decided June 12, 1980

Court of Customs and Patent Appeals cannot agree with the position that it is only patentee's claims that constitute evidence of what patentee invented; it does not follow from fact that it is claims that define subject matter that applicant regards as his invention, 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph that specification should be ignored in determining what patentee invented; to the contrary, claims are to be construed in light of specifications and both are to be read with view to ascertaining invention.

and further as stated in;

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

United States V Adams et al

No. 55 ; Decided Feb. 21, 1966

148 USPQ 479

While patent claims limit invention, and specification cannot be utilized to expand monopoly, claims are construed in light of specification and both are read with a view to ascertain the invention.

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 12

PAPER # 6

In regard to rejection of claim 4, under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, comment is made as being "incomplete for omitting essential steps". The reply to this rejection is that in the preamble of this claim "method of focusing", Then on referring to section "b - said elongated light reflector **extending** --- ", The word "extending" being the gerund of extend. Further, referring now to section "c - ----- comprising an arc **straddling** said --- which is also part of the method of the steps of focusing downlight.. This then overcomes the rejection of claim 4 under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph particularly in view of the above citations of In re CLEMENS et al, and U.S. V ADAMS

Request is now made to withdraw this rejection of claim 4.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is to be in accord with the statute, which is shown below and wherein a requirement is to consider the subject matter as a "whole".

35 U.S.C. 103(a) Conditions for patentability

non-obvious subject matter

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the **subject matter as a whole** would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
(bold and underlining added)

Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a), as being unpatentable under Russo (4,435,744) in view of Figueroa (5,192,129) . Reference is made , in the Office Action , to Graham V John Deere Co.148 USPQ 459 to establish a background for determining obviousness however, a major consideration was left out which is "subject matter as a whole " as stated in 35 U.S.C. 103 (a)., and is so stated in summary paragraph 10, on page 460; of Graham V John Deere

10 Patentability --Tests of - In general
Patentability must be determined by consideration of subject
matter sought to be patented taken as a whole..

Lines 1 - 3 on page 4 of the Office Action paper #5 are in error as comment is made that (Russo shows a fluorescent light fixture "10" having a reflector "84" which is attached at its ends to socket mount/wire raceway arms "12,14" and a ballast channel assembly " 72,74" with a ballast "76" which attaches to the raceway arms "12,14") The errors are "12 14" are described in the Russo patent '744 in col. 3, line 44 as "space apart ends" not raceway arms, and further legends "72,74" are described in the patent as "wire raceways" col. 4 , line 45,.not ballast channel assembly.

Russo '744 shows a single reflector to cover both lamps and is described in col.5, lines 9 and 10 as " - a reflector 84 is provided and positioned over the fluorescent lamps 86, 87 and globes 90, 92 which protectively enclose the lamps, - " which is at variance with this present application disclosing a single elongated light reflector over each elongated fluorescent tube light.

Further comment is made in the Office Action , paper 5, that "Figueroa teaches in Figs 8 and 9, respectively , the equivalence between a single integral reflector such as Russo's reflector "84" and two reflectors joined by overlapping adjacent rim edges." This present application discloses and claims overlapping rim edges of the elongated light reflectors , which is at significant variance from Figueroa, as on referring to Fig. 8 of Figueroa shows nesting of the bent angles , and is described in Figueroa lines 44 - 48, col. 4 "Outermost surfaces -- terminate at the free ends thereof with outwardly projecting inclined extensions 31 -- ". This is at variance from this present application with rims extending outwards and are not projecting inclined extensions .

The light reflectors of Figueroa have a plurality of light reflecting planar surfaces inclined toward the light source . This is vastly different than the elongated light reflectors described and claimed in this application..

Vacuum metallization process as stated in the Office Action, is of no consequence in this application as the application does not include such matter. Further comment is made in page 4 of the Office Action , penultimate paragraph , of providing a light weight reflector. Here again the matter of light weight is of no consequence as such matter is not included in this application .

Claims 1 and 6 now overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of above discussion , and request is made to withdraw such rejection and allow these claims 1 and 6 as amended.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Russo and Figueroa as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Rodin (4,928,209).

This claim 5, as amended , depends from claim 1, and as such overcomes the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) in view of Russo and Figueroa as discussed above regarding claim 1.

Referring now to Rodin '209 patent , which is vastly different from the fixture of this patent application in that on referring to Rodin patent line 13 - 18, col. 3 "a housing 12 -- may be of an ordinary box-like shape, (see Fig. 1 of Rodin). In this present application there is no box-like shape over the reflectors. In Rodin the bulbs 44 are held by hangers 64 (see Fig. 3) And each of said hangers is connected to and supported by the reflector 24 (see lines 37 - 50, col. 4) of Rodin . This present application shows the elongated light tubes being held by being plugged into sockets.

Rodin discloses the "bulbs supported by hangers, and not by the sockets" (see lines 63 - 66 col. 4) .

In the last sentence of the first paragraph on page 5 of the Office Action states "it would have been obvious -- to provide elongated fluorescent light fixture -- of Russo and Figueroa with six light tubes instead of two as shown by Rodin ". The reply to this is that it is the fixture assembly which is the invention not the number of lights..

ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT LLC
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS 53073
REG. #28958
TEL: 920 892 8556
FAX: 920 892 8557

FILE # OR-1-02

DATE 8/12/2003

Page 15

PAPER # 6

In all of the above discussion, comments and claims the term "fluorescent light tube" and "fluorescent tube light" have the same meaning and are synonymous.

COMMENTS REGARDING NEW CLAIMS 7 AND 8.

Claim 7 is derived from claims 1, 5, and 6 and does not include any new matter.

Claim 8 is derived from claims 1, 2, and 3 in response to the comment in the Office Action that claims 2 and 3 would be allowed if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 paragraph 2, set forth in the Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Request is now made to withdraw all rejections, in view of above rebuttal, and allow all claims 1 - 8 that a patent will issue thereon.

Respectfully submitted,

INVENTOR; NEAL R. VERFUERTH

By; ROBERT T. JOHNSON
REGISTERED PATENT AGENT
603 COLLINS ST.
PLYMOUTH, WIS. 53073
REG. NO. 28,958



AUG 14 2003



22496

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE